

Application Number: 10/736,100

Amendments to Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions of claims in the application:

1. (Currently amended) A process to give a true indication of respondent satisfaction to an electronic questionnaire survey of a subject matter which is affected by human satisfaction, which is characterised by including the steps of:

asking the respondent or plurality of respondents to give their answers to two sets of questions on a computer

with both basing the said two sets of questions being based on similar statements, but posed differently, so that the first said set of questions are answered emotionally by said respondent or plurality of respondents and the second said set of questions are answered rationally

the survey initiator ranking the said statements used in both said sets of questions dynamically generating the said second set of questions at the time of said questionnaire survey, based upon the answers to the said first set of questions

ranking the responses to both said sets of questions programmatically using said computer,

comparing said rankings from both said sets of questions programmatically using said computer

and based on these results, recording computer calculated values for satisfaction and level of conviction within said computer's memory based on said comparison both of which can be presented presenting the said calculated values for satisfaction and level of conviction (the weighted score) to said respondent at the time of said survey on said computer's output device.

Application Number: 10/736,100

2. (Currently amended) The method process according to claim 1 of subdividing the said subject matter of said questionnaire survey into a number of ranked common groups in which the number of said statements is calculated and are equally distributed in number amongst the said groups and are ranked within the each said group according to the importance of the statement to the survey initiator.

3. (Currently amended) The method process according to claim 1 of defining two sets of said similar statements in which both sets of statements contain sentences with the same meaning, but using different words so that the first said set can be used in a set of questions designed to be responded to emotionally on said computer and the second said set can be combined to answer the questions rationally on said computer.

4. (Cancelled)

5. (Currently amended) The method process according to claim 1 of defining a said second set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said second set of questions are dynamically created by dynamically group grouping together a number of statements from said second set of statements at the time of questionnaire on said computer based on the responses to said first set of statements questions, ~~which force the respondent to respond rationally.~~

6. (Cancelled)

7. (Currently amended) The method process according to ~~claim-6~~ claim 5 in which said second set of questions questions are defined so that the respondent is forced to respond rationally to said group of statements on said computer.

8. (Currently amended) The method process according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking said responses to said first set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said respondent's emotional response has a value calculated programmatically on said computer, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's emotional responses to said questions and then ranked programmatically on said computer.